arXiv:1512.04696v1 [math.PR] 15 Dec 2015

n-type Markov Branching Processes with Immigration

LI JUNPING * *Central South University*
WANG JUAN ** *Central South University*
ZANG YANCHAO *** *Central South University*

Abstract

In this paper, we consider n-type Markov branching processes with immigration and resurrection. The uniqueness criteria are first established. Then, a new method is found and the explicit expression of extinction probability is successfully obtained in the absorption case, the mean extinction time is also given. The recurrence and ergodicity criteria are given if the state **0** is not absorptive. Finally, if the resurrection rates are same as the immigration rates, the branching property and decay property are discussed in detail, it is shown that the process is a superimposition of a n-type branching process and an immigration. The exact value of the decay parameter λ_Z is given for the irreducible class $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Moreover, the corresponding λ_Z-invariant measures/vectors and quasi-distributions are presented.

Keywords: n-type Markov branching process, immigration, recurrence, branching property, decay parameter, invariant measures/vectors

AMS 2000 SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION: PRIMARY 60J27
SECONDARY 60J35

1. Introduction

Markov branching processes occupy a major niche in the theory and applications of probability theory. Good references are, among many others, Harris [11], Athreya and Ney [5] and Asmussen and Hering [3], Athreya and Jagers [4]. Within this framework both state-independent and state-dependent immigration have important roles to play. For the former, Sevast'yanov [25] and Vatutin [26]-[27] considered a branching process with state-independent immigration. Aksland [2] considered a modified birth-death process where the state-independent immigration is imposed on a simple birth-death underlying structure. On the other hand, the latter (state-dependent immigration) can be traced to Foster [10] and Pakes [19] who considered a discrete branching process with immigration occurring only when the process occupies state 0. Yamazato [28] investigated the continuous-time version, See also the discussion in Pakes and Tavaré [20].

The decay parameter and the quasi-stationary distributions are closely linked with the development of continuous time Markov chains. The idea of using quasi-stationary dis-

* Postal address: School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central South University, Changsha, 410075, China. E-mail address: jpli@mail.csu.edu.cn

** Postal address: School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central South University, Changsha, 410075, China. E-mail address: wangjuanrose@126.com

*** Postal address: School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central South University, Changsha, 410075, China. E-mail address: zycmail@126.com

tribution can be traced back at least to the early work of Yaglom [33], who considered the long-run behavior, in a sense of the subcritical Galton-Watson process. The decay parameter was developed by Kingman in early 1960's. Beginning with the pioneering and remarkable work of Kingman [14] and Vere-Jones [30], this extremely useful theory has been flourished owing to many important researches, including the significant contributions made by Flaspohler [9], Pakes [20], Pollett [22]–[24], Darroch and Seneta [8], Kelly [12], Kijima [13], Nair and Pollett [18], Tweedie [29], Van Doorn [31] and many others.

n-type Markov branching process has been discussed in Harris [11], Athreya and Ney [5]. The aim of this paper is to consider the n-type branching processes with immigration and resurrection, which is the further extension of the n-type Markov branching process. We will discuss the extinction behavior, recurrence property and decay property. The evolution of a n-type branching process with immigration can be intuitively described as follows:

(i) Consider a system involving n types of particles. The life length of a type i particle is exponentially distributed with mean $\theta_i, i = 1, \cdots, n$.

(ii) Particles give "offspring" independently. When a type i particle splits(dies), it produces j_1 particles of type 1, $\cdots$, j_n particles of type n, with probability $p^{(i)}_{j_1,\cdots,j_n}$.

(iii) When the system is empty, the immigration still occurs.

(iv) If particles are migrant from the external environment, then they will follow the same reproductive rules as the original particles in the system .

We begin our research by giving the formal definition of n-type branching process with immigration. Throughout this paper, we adopt the following conventions:

(C-1) $\mathbf{Z}^n_+ = \{(i_1, \cdots, i_n) : i_1, \cdots, i_n \in \mathbf{Z}_+\}$, for any $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \cdots, i_n) \in \mathbf{Z}^n_+$, denote $|\mathbf{i}| = \sum_{k=1}^n i_k$.

(C-2) $[0, 1]^n = \{(u_1, \cdots, u_n) : 0 \le u_1, \cdots, u_n \le 1\}$.

(C-3) $\chi_{\mathbf{Z}^n_+}(\cdot)$ is the indicator of $\mathbf{Z}^n_+$.

(C-4) $\mathbf{0} = (0, \cdots, 0)$, $\mathbf{1} = (1, \cdots, 1)$, $\mathbf{e}_i = (0, \cdots, 1_i, \cdots, 0)$ are vectors in $[0, 1]^n$.

Definition 1.1. A q-matrix $Q = (q_{\mathbf{ij}}; \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}^n_+)$ is called an n-type branching with immigration q-matrix (henceforth referred to as a nTBI q-matrix) if it takes the following form:

$$q_{\mathbf{ij}} = \begin{cases} h_{\mathbf{j}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}^n_+}(\mathbf{j}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| = 0 \\ \sum_{k=1}^n i_k b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}^n_+}(\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{e}_k) + a_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}^n_+}(\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{i}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} h_{\mathbf{j}} \ge 0 (\mathbf{j} \ne \mathbf{0}), 0 < \sum_{\mathbf{j}\ne\mathbf{0}} h_{\mathbf{j}} = -h_{\mathbf{0}} < \infty; \\ a_{\mathbf{j}} \ge 0 (\mathbf{j} \ne \mathbf{0}), 0 < \sum_{\mathbf{j}\ne\mathbf{0}} a_{\mathbf{j}} = -a_{\mathbf{0}} < \infty \\ b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{j}} \ge 0 \ (\mathbf{j} \ne \mathbf{e}_k), \ 0 < \sum_{\mathbf{j}\ne\mathbf{e}_k} b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{j}} = -b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{e}_k} < \infty, \quad k = 1, \cdots, n. \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

Remark 1.1. $\{h_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \ne \mathbf{0}\}$ denotes the "resurrection rate", $\{a_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \ne \mathbf{0}\}$ denotes the "immigration rate" whilst $\{b_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \ne \mathbf{e}_k\}$ denotes the "branching rate".

Definition 1.2. An n-type branching process with immigration(henceforth referred to simply as a nTBIP) is a continuous-time Markov chain with state space $\mathbf{Z}^n_+$, whose transition function $P(t) = (p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}^n_+)$ satisfies Kolmogorov forward equation

$$P'(t) = P(t)Q \tag{1.3}$$

where Q is a nTBI q-matrix as given in $(1.1)-(1.2)$.

Here we have defined the Q-process as the corresponding transition $P(t)$ rather than the process itself. In fact, for convenience, we shall freely use this term to denote either of them in this paper. This is, of course, commonly accepted and will not cause any confusion.

By Kingman [14], we know that there exists a number $\lambda_C \geq 0$, called the decay parameter of the process $P(t)$, such that for all $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in C$ (where C is a irreducible class),

$$\frac{1}{t} \log p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) \to -\lambda_C \quad \text{as } t \to +\infty.$$

On the other hand, let

$$\mu_{\mathbf{ij}} = \inf\{\lambda \geq 0 : \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)dt = \infty\} = \sup\{\lambda \geq 0 : \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)dt < \infty\}.$$

By the irreducibility argument, it is fairly easy to show that $\mu_{\mathbf{ij}}$ does not depend on $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in C$. Denote the common value of $\mu_{\mathbf{ij}}$ by μ. It is straightforward to show that the common abscissa of convergence of these integrals is just the decay parameter, i.e., $\lambda_C = \mu$.

It is well known that the decay parameter and quasi-stationary distributions are closely linked with the so-called μ-subinvariant/invariant measures and μ-subinvariant/invariant vectors. An elementary but detailed discussion of this theory can be seen in Anderson [1]. For convenience, we briefly repeat these definitions, tailored for our special models, as follows:

Definition 1.3. Let $Q = (q_{\mathbf{ij}}; \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ be an nTBI q-matrix and C be a irreducible class. Assume that $\mu \geq 0$. A set $(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} \in C)$ of strictly positive numbers is called a μ-subinvariant measure for Q on C if

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in C} m_{\mathbf{i}} q_{\mathbf{ij}} \leq -\mu m_{\mathbf{j}}, \quad \mathbf{j} \in C. \tag{1.4}$$

If the equality holds in (1.4), then $(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} \in C)$ is called a μ-invariant measure for Q on C.

Definition 1.4. Let $P(t) = (p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ be an nTBIP and C be a irreducible class. Assume that $\mu \geq 0$. A set $(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} \in C)$ of strictly positive numbers is called a μ-subinvariant measure for $P(t)$ on C if

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in C} m_{\mathbf{i}} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) \leq e^{-\mu t} m_{\mathbf{j}}, \quad \mathbf{j} \in C. \tag{1.5}$$

If the equality holds in (1.5), then $(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} \in C)$ is called a μ-invariant measure for $P(t)$ on C.

The subinvariant/invariant vectors can be similarly defined.

Definition 1.5. Let $P(t) = (p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ be an nTBIP and C be a communicating class. Assume that $(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} \in C)$ is a probability distribution over C. Let $p_{\mathbf{j}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in C} m_{\mathbf{i}} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)$, for $\mathbf{j} \in C, t \geq 0$. If

$$\frac{p_{\mathbf{j}}(t)}{\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in C} p_{\mathbf{i}}(t)} = m_{\mathbf{j}}, \quad \mathbf{j} \in C, t > 0, \tag{1.6}$$

then $(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} \in C)$ is called a quasi-stationary distribution.

The deep relationship between invariant measures and quasi-stationary distributions has been revealed by the important work of Van Doorn [31], and Nair and Pollett [18].

For the one-dimensional Markov branching processes with immigration, the extinction probability and exact value of decay parameter are well-known. The basic aim of this paper is to investigate the extinction behavior, recurrence property and decay property of n-type Markov branching processes with immigration. Different from the one-dimensional cases, when a particle of one type in the system splits, the number of particles of different type may change. Therefore, the method used in the one-dimensional case fails and some new approaches should be used in the current situation. In this paper, we find a new method (see, Theorem 3.1) to investigate the deep properties of the n-type Markov branching processes with immigration. Furthermore, this new method can be available in discussing related models and also be available in solving some kind of partial differential equations.

The structure of this paper is organized as follows. Regularity and uniqueness criteria together with some preliminary results are firstly establish in Section 2. In Section 3, we are concentrated on discussing the absorptive nTBIP(i.e., without resurrection) for which the most interesting problem is the extinction probability. In section 4, we mainly consider the case $h_{\mathbf{0}} \neq 0$ and the recurrence criteria are given. In the following Section 5 and Section 6, we discuss the branching property and decay properties. Note that if $h_{\mathbf{j}} = a_{\mathbf{j}}$, then the branching property and the decay properties of the corresponding process will be well-discussed and understood. For this reason, we shall assume that $h_{\mathbf{j}} = a_{\mathbf{j}}$ in Section 5 and Section 6.

2. Preliminary and uniqueness

Since the q-matrix Q is determined by the sequences $\{h_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n\}$, $\{a_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n\}$ and $\{b_{\mathbf{j}}^{(i)}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n\}$ $(i = 1, \cdots, n)$, we define their generating functions as

$$
\begin{aligned}
H(u_1, \cdots, u_n) &= \sum_{j_1=0}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{j_n=0}^{\infty} h_{j_1,\cdots,j_n} u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n};\\
A(u_1, \cdots, u_n) &= \sum_{j_1=0}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{j_n=0}^{\infty} a_{j_1,\cdots,j_n} u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n};\\
B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n) &= \sum_{j_1=0}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{j_n=0}^{\infty} b_{j_1,\cdots,j_n}^{(i)} u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n}, \quad i = 1, \cdots, n.
\end{aligned}
$$

For the sake of convenience in writing, here we write $\{h_{(j_1,\cdots,j_n)}; (j_1, \cdots, j_n) \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n\}$ as $\{h_{j_1,\cdots,j_n}; (j_1, \cdots, j_n) \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n\}$, $\{a_{(j_1,\cdots,j_n)}; (j_1, \cdots, j_n) \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n\}$ as $\{a_{j_1,\cdots,j_n}; (j_1, \cdots, j_n) \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n\}$ and $\{b_{(j_1,\cdots,j_n)}^{(i)}; (j_1, \cdots, j_n) \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n\}$ as $\{b_{j_1,\cdots,j_n}^{(i)}; (j_1, \cdots, j_n) \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n\}$, these would not cause any confusion. It is clear that $A(u_1, \cdots, u_n)$ and each $B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n)$ are well defined at least on $[0, 1]^n$.

In order to discuss the n-type Markov branching processes with immigration, we need some preparations. In this section, we first investigate the properties of the generating

functions $H(u_1,\cdots,u_n)$, $A(u_1,\cdots,u_n)$ and $\{B_i(u_1,\cdots,u_n); i=1,\cdots,n\}$. Let

$$H_j(u_1,\cdots,u_n)=\frac{\partial H(u_1,\cdots,u_n)}{\partial u_j},\quad j=1,\cdots,n.$$

$$A_j(u_1,\cdots,u_n)=\frac{\partial A(u_1,\cdots,u_n)}{\partial u_j},\quad j=1,\cdots,n.$$

$$B_{ij}(u_1,\cdots,u_n)=\frac{\partial B_i(u_1,\cdots,u_n)}{\partial u_j},\quad i,j=1,\cdots,n.$$

$$g_{ij}(u_1,\cdots,u_n)=\delta_{ij}-\frac{B_{ij}(u_1,\cdots,u_n)}{b^{(i)}_{\mathbf{e}_i}},\quad i,j=1,\cdots,n.$$

where $u_1,\cdots,u_n\in[0,1]$ and δ_{ij} is the Dirac function. The matrices $(B_{ij}(u_1,\cdots,u_n))$ and $(g_{ij}(u_1,\cdots,u_n))$ are denoted by $B(u_1,\cdots,u_n)$ and $G(u_1,\cdots,u_n)$, respectively.

Definition 2.1. Generating functions $\{B_i(u_1,\cdots,u_n); 1\le i\le n\}$ is called singular if there exists an $n\times n$ matrix M such that

$$(B_1(u_1,\cdots,u_n),\cdots,B_n(u_1,\cdots,u_n))'=M\cdot(u_1,\cdots,u_n)'$$

where $(x_1,\cdots,x_n)'$ denotes the transpose of the vector $(x_1,\cdots,x_n)$.

Definition 2.2. A nonnegative $n\times n$ matrix $A=(a_{ij})$ is called positively regular if there exists $N>0$, such that $A^N>0$.

If $\{B_i(u_1,\cdots,u_n); 1\le i\le n\}$ is singular, then each particle has exactly one offspring, and hence the branching process will be equivalent to an ordinary finite Markov chain. In order to avoid discussing such trivial cases, we shall assume throughout this paper that the following conditions are satisfied:

(**A**-1). $\{B_i(u_1,\cdots,u_n); 1\le i\le n\}$ is nonsingular;

(**A**-2). $B_{ij}(1,\cdots,1)<+\infty,\ i,j=1,\cdots,n$;

(**A**-3). $G(1,\cdots,1)$ is positively regular.

Lemma 2.1. *$A(u_1,\cdots,u_n)<0$ for all $u_1,\cdots,u_n\in[0,1)$ and $\lim_{u_1\uparrow 1,\cdots,u_n\uparrow 1}A(u_1,\cdots,u_n)=A(1,\cdots,1)=0$. Similar property holds for $H(u_1,\cdots,u_n)$.*

Proof. All the conclusions are easy to be proved by some simple algebra operations and thus we omitted here. □

The following Lemma is a direct consequence of Li and Wang [17], thus the proof is omitted here.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose $G(1,\cdots,1)$ is positively regular and $\{B_i(u_1,\cdots,u_n); 1\le i\le n\}$ is nonsingular. Then the equation*

$$\begin{cases} B_1(u_1,\cdots,u_n)=0;\\ B_2(u_1,\cdots,u_n)=0;\\ \qquad\cdots\\ B_n(u_1,\cdots,u_n)=0. \end{cases}\tag{2.1}$$

has at most two solutions in $[0,1]^n$. Let $\mathbf{q}=(q_1,\cdots,q_n)$ and $\rho(u_1,\cdots,u_n)$ denote the smallest nonnegative solution to (2.1) and the maximal eigenvalues of $B(u_1,\cdots,u_n)$, respectively. Then,

(i) q_i *is the extinction probability when the Feller minimal process starts at state* $\mathbf{e}_i$ $(i = 1, \cdots, n)$. *Moreover, if* $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \le 0$, *then* $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{1}$; *while if* $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) > 0$, *then* $\mathbf{q} < \mathbf{1}$, *i.e.,* $q_1, \cdots, q_n < 1$.

(ii) $\rho(q_1, \cdots, q_n) \le 0$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let* $P(t) = (p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ *and* $\Phi(\lambda) = (\phi_{\mathbf{ij}}(\lambda); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ *be the Feller minimal Q-function and Q-resolvent, respectively, where Q is given in* (1.1) − (1.2). *Then for any* $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$ *and* $(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \in [0, 1)^n$, *we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial F_{\mathbf{i}}(t, u_1, \cdots, u_n)}{\partial t} =& H(u_1, \cdots, u_n) p_{\mathbf{i0}}(t) + A(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n \setminus \mathbf{0}} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n} \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{n} B_k(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \frac{\partial F_{\mathbf{i}}(t, u_1, \cdots, u_n)}{\partial u_k}\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $F_{\mathbf{i}}(t, u_1, \cdots, u_n) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n}$, *or in resolvent version*

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda \Phi_{\mathbf{i}}(\lambda, u_1, \cdots, u_n) - u_1^{i_1} \cdots u_n^{i_n} \\ =& H(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \phi_{\mathbf{i0}}(\lambda) + A(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n \setminus \mathbf{0}} \phi_{\mathbf{ij}}(\lambda) u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n} \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{n} B_k(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \frac{\partial \Phi_{\mathbf{i}}(\lambda, u_1, \cdots, u_n)}{\partial u_k}\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where $\Phi_{\mathbf{i}}(\lambda, u_1, \cdots, u_n) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \phi_{\mathbf{ij}}(\lambda) u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n}$.

Proof. By the Kolmogorov forward equations, we have that for any $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$,

$$p'_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(t) [\sum_{l=1}^{n} k_l b^{(l)}_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{e}_l} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_l) + a_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{k}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k})(1 - \delta_{\mathbf{0k}}) + h_{\mathbf{j}} \cdot \delta_{\mathbf{0k}}]$$

Multiplying $u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n}$ on both sides of the above equality and summing over $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$ we immediately obtain (2.2). Taking Laplace transform on both sides of (2.2) immediately yields (2.3). □

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose* $G(1, \cdots, 1)$ *is positively regular and* $\{B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n); 1 \le i \le n\}$ *is nonsingular. If* $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \le 0$, *then the Q-function is honest.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.5 of Li and Wang [17], we know that if $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \le 0$, then $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{1}$. Denote

$$r^* = \sup\{r \ge 0; B_k(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = r,\ k = 1, \cdots, n \text{ has a solution in } [0, 1]^n\}.$$

By Lemma 2.7 of Li and Wang [17], we know that $r^* > 0$ and for any $r \in (0, r^*]$, there exist $u_1(r), \cdots, u_n(r) \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$B_k(u_1(r), \cdots, u_n(r)) = r,\ k = 1, \cdots, n$$

and moreover,

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} u_k(r) = 1, \quad k = 1, \cdots, n.$$

Letting $u_k = u_k(r),\ (k = 1, \cdots, n)$ in (2.2) and letting $r \downarrow 0$ yield

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) \geq 1$$

i.e., $\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) = 1$, then the Q-process is honest. □

Having completed the preparation, we now prove that for any given nTBI q-matrix Q defined in $(1.1) - (1.2)$, there always exists exactly one Q-process satisfying Kolmogorov forward equation.

Theorem 2.1. *Let Q be a nTBI q-matrix defined as* (1.1)–(1.2)*. Then there exists exactly one nTBIP, i.e., the Feller minimal process.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.4, We only need to consider the cases that $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) > 0$ or $\sum_{k=1}^n B_k(1, \cdots, 1) < 0$. For this purpose, we will show that the equations

$$\begin{cases} \eta(\lambda I - Q) = 0, \quad \eta_{\mathbf{j}} \geq 0,\ \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n, \\ \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} \eta_{\mathbf{j}} < +\infty \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

have only trivial solution. Suppose that the contrary is true and let $\eta = (\eta_{\mathbf{j}};\ \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ be a non-trivial solution of (2.4) corresponding to $\lambda = 1$. Then, by (2.4) we have

$$\eta_{\mathbf{j}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} \eta_{\mathbf{k}} \Big(\sum_{i=1}^n k_i b^{(i)}_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{e}_i} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{e}_i) + a_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{k}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{k})(1-\delta_{\mathbf{0k}}) + h_{\mathbf{j}} \cdot \delta_{\mathbf{0k}}\Big). \tag{2.5}$$

Multiplying $u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n}$ on both sides of (2.5) and using some algebra yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \cdot \frac{\partial \eta(u_1, \cdots, u_n)}{\partial u_i} \\ & + A(u_1, \cdots, u_n)(\eta(u_1, \cdots, u_n) - \eta_{\mathbf{0}}) + H(u_1, \cdots, u_n)\eta_{\mathbf{0}}. \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - A(u_1, \cdots, u_n))[\eta(u_1, \cdots, u_n) - \eta_{\mathbf{0}}] + (1 - H(u_1, \cdots, u_n))\eta_{\mathbf{0}} \\ = \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \cdot \frac{\partial \eta(u_1, \cdots, u_n)}{\partial u_i}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

If $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) > 0$ or $\sum_{k=1}^n B_k(1, \cdots, 1) < 0$, then by Lemma 2.2 and the irreducibility of $\tilde{Q}$ we know from that (2.1) has a solution $(q_1, \cdots, q_n) \in (0, 1)^n$. Let $(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = (q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ in (2.6), we can see that the right-hand side of (2.6) is zero. Therefore, the left-hand side of (2.6) must be zero, which implies that $\eta_{\mathbf{j}} = 0$ $(\forall \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$. The proof is completed. □

3. Extinction Property

In this section, we shall discuss the extinction property of the nTBIP in the case that $h_{\mathbf{0}} = 0$. In this case, the most interesting problem is the extinction probability. Let $\tilde{Q}$

denote the corresponding absorptive nTBI q-matrix and $\tilde{P}(t) = (\tilde{p}_{\mathbf{ij}}(t); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ denote the Feller minimal $\tilde{Q}$-function. Also let $a_{\mathbf{i0}} = \lim_{t\to\infty} \tilde{p}_{\mathbf{i0}}(t)$ be the extinction probability of $\tilde{P}(t)$ starting at state $\mathbf{i}$. In order to discuss the extinction property, we need the following important result, which plays a key role in our discussion.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that $G(1, \cdots, 1)$ is positively regular, $\{B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n); 1 \le i \le n\}$ is nonsingular. If $B_1(0, \cdots, 0) > 0$, then the system of equations*

$$\begin{cases} u_k'(u) = \frac{B_k(u,u_2,\cdots,u_n)}{B_1(u,u_2,\cdots,u_n)}, & 2 \le k \le n \\ u_k|_{u=0} = 0, & 2 \le k \le n \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

has a unique solution $(u_k(u); 2 \le k \le n)$. Furthermore, this solution satisfies

(i) $(u_k(u); 2 \le k \le n)$ is well defined on $[0, q_1]$;

(ii) $u_k'(0) \ge 0$ and $u_k'(u) > 0$ for all $u \in (0, q_1)$ and $2 \le k \le n$;

(iii) $u_k(q_1) = q_k, \quad 2 \le k \le n$.

Proof. Since $B_1(0, \cdots, 0) > 0$, we know that $B_1(u, 0, \cdots, 0) = 0$ has a positive root $u^* \in (0, 1]$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\{\frac{B_k(u,u_2,\cdots,u_n)}{B_1(u,u_2,\cdots,u_n)};\ 2 \le k \le n\}$ satisfy Lipschitz condition on $[0, u^* - \varepsilon] \times [0, 1]^{n-1}$, therefore, by the theory of differential equations, (3.1) has a unique solution $(u_k(u); 2 \le k \le n)$ defined on $[0, u^* - \varepsilon]$. Furthermore, (3.1) has a unique solution $(u_k(u); 2 \le k \le n)$ defined on $[0, u^*)$ since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary.

We claim that $u_k'(u) \ge 0$ $(2 \le k \le n)$ for all $u \in [0, u^*)$. In fact, if there exist $u \in [0, u^*)$ and $2 \le k \le n$ such that $u_k'(u) < 0$, denote

$$\tilde{u} = \inf\{u \in [0, u^*) :\ u_k'(u) < 0 \text{ for some } \ k \in \{2, \cdots, n\}\}$$

and

$$H = \{k \in \{2, \cdots, n\} :\ \exists\ \varepsilon > 0 \text{ s.t. } u_k'(u) < 0 \text{ for } u \in (\tilde{u}, \tilde{u} + \varepsilon)\}.$$

It is obvious that $H \ne \emptyset$, say $H = \{\tilde{k}, \cdots, n\}$ for convenience. It is easy to see that

$$B_k(\tilde{u}, u_2(\tilde{u}), \cdots, u_n(\tilde{u})) = 0, \quad k \in H$$

and there exists $\bar{u} \in (\tilde{u}, u_1^*)$ such that $u_k(\bar{u}) \ge u_k(\tilde{u})$ $(k < \tilde{k})$, $u_k(\bar{u}) < u_k(\tilde{u})$ $(k \in H)$ and

$$B_k(\bar{u}, u_2(\bar{u}), \cdots, u_n(\bar{u})) < 0, \quad k \in H. \tag{3.2}$$

Consider

$$I = \{B_k(\bar{u}, u_2(\bar{u}), \cdots, u_{\tilde{k}-1}(\bar{u}), u_{\tilde{k}}, \cdots, u_n);\ k \in H\}.$$

Obviously,

$$B_k(\bar{u}, u_2(\bar{u}), \cdots, u_{\tilde{k}-1}(\bar{u}), u_{\tilde{k}}(\tilde{u}), \cdots, u_n(\tilde{u})) \ge 0;\ k \in H.$$

Therefore, the smallest nonnegative zeros of I is in $\prod_{k=\tilde{k}}^n [u_k(\tilde{u}), 1]$. Combining with (3.2) we know that $u_k(\bar{u}) \ge u_k(\tilde{u})$ $(k \in H)$ which contradicts with $u_k(\bar{u}) < u_k(\tilde{u})$ $(k \in H)$.

We further claim that $u_k'(u) > 0$ $(2 \le k \le n)$ for all $u \in (0, u^*]$. In fact, suppose that there exists $\hat{u} \in (0, u^*]$ such that

$$B_k(\hat{u}, u_2(\hat{u}), \cdots, u_n(\hat{u})) = 0$$

for some $k \geq 2$. Denote

$$\hat{H} = \{k; B_k(\hat{u}, u_2(\hat{u}), \cdots, u_n(\hat{u})) = 0\}$$

and

$$\hat{H}^c = \{1, 2, \cdots, n\} \setminus \hat{H}.$$

It is easy to see that $\hat{H}^c \neq \emptyset$. By the irreducibility of the set of nonzero states we know that there exist $k \in \hat{H}, j \in \hat{H}^c$ such that

$$B_{kj}(\hat{u}, u_2(\hat{u}), \cdots, u_n(\hat{u})) > 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\lim_{u \uparrow \hat{u}} \frac{B_k(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u))}{u - \hat{u}} = \sum_{i \in \hat{H}^c} B_{ki}(\hat{u}, u_2(\hat{u}), \cdots, u_n(\hat{u})) \cdot u_i'(\hat{u}) > 0,$$

which contradicts with $B_k(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u)) \geq 0$ for all $u \in [0, u^*]$, where $u_1'(\hat{u}) = 1$.

Since $B_1(u^*, u_2(u^*), \cdots, u_n(u^*)) > B_1(u^*, 0, \cdots, 0) = 0$, we can apply the mathematics induction to prove that the solution of (3.1) can be uniquely extended to $[0, q_1)$. Now, we claim that

$$u_k(q_1) = \lim_{u \uparrow q_1} u_k(u) = q_k, \quad k \geq 2.$$

Indeed, since $B_k(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u)) > 0,\ (k \geq 1)$ for all $u \in (0, q_1)$, it can be easily seen that $u_k(u) \in (0, q_k)\ (k \geq 2)$ for all $u \in (0, q_1)$ and therefore, $u_k(q_1) \in (0, q_k]$ for all $k \geq 2$. If $u_k(q_1) < q_k$ for some $k \geq 2$, denote

$$M = \{k \geq 2; u_k(q_1) < q_k\}, \qquad M^c = \{1, 2, \cdots, n\} \setminus M.$$

It follows from the irreducibility of the set of nonzero states we know that there exists $j \in M^c$ such that

$$\lim_{u \uparrow q_1} B_j(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u)) = B_j(q_1, u_2(q_1), \cdots, u_n(q_1)) < 0,$$

which contradicts with $B_j(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u)) > 0$ for all $u \in (0, q_1)$. □

Corollary 3.1. *Suppose that $G(1, \cdots, 1)$ is positively regular, $\{B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n); 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is nonsingular. If $B_1(0, \cdots, 0) > 0,\ B_2(0, \cdots, 0) > 0$, then the system of equations*

$$\begin{cases} u_k'(u) = \frac{B_k(u_1, u, \cdots, u_n)}{B_2(u_1, u, \cdots, u_n)}, & k \neq 2 \\ u_k|_{u=0} = 0, & k \neq 2 \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

has the same solution as (3.1).

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, we know that (3.3) has a unique solution. For convenience, we denote the solutions to (3.3) by $(u_1(u_2), u_3(u_2), \cdots, u_n(u_2))$. Since $u_1'(u_2) > 0$ for all $u_2 \in [0, q_2)$, we know that the function $u_1(u_2),\ (u_2 \in [0, q_2))$ has inverse function $u_2 = f_2(u_1),\ (u_1 \in [0, q_1))$ satisfying $\frac{df_2}{du_1} = 1/u_1'$. Let $u_k = f_k(u_1) = u_k(f_2(u_1))\ (u_1 \in [0, q_1])$ for $k \geq 3$. It can be easily seen that $u_k = f_k(u_1),\ (k \geq 2)$ is the solution to (3.1). □

In this paper, we do not consider the trivial case that any particle will never dye. Therefore, by Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.1, we will always assume that $B_1(0,\cdots,0)>0$ without loss of generality and let $(u_2(u),\cdots,u_n(u))$ $(u\in[0,q_1])$ denote the unique solution to (3.1).

Before stating our main result in this section, we first provide two useful lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t);\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ be the Feller minimal Q-function where Q is an absorptive nTBI q-matrix. Then for any $\mathbf{i}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n$,*

$$\int_0^\infty p_{\mathbf{ik}}(t)dt<\infty,\quad \mathbf{k}\neq\mathbf{0} \tag{3.4}$$

and thus

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}p_{\mathbf{ik}}(t)=0,\quad \mathbf{i}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n,\mathbf{k}\neq\mathbf{0}. \tag{3.5}$$

Moreover, for any $\mathbf{i}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n\setminus\mathbf{0}$ and $(u_1,u_2,\cdots,u_n)\in[0,1)^n$, we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}\neq\mathbf{0}}\Big(\int_0^\infty p_{\mathbf{ik}}(t)dt\Big)\cdot u_1^{k_1}u_2^{k_2}\cdots u_n^{k_n}<\infty. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. It follows from the Kolmogorov forward equations that

$$p_{\mathbf{i0}}(t)=\delta_{\mathbf{i0}}+b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(1)}\cdot\int_0^t p_{\mathbf{ie}_1}(u)du$$

which clearly implies that $\int_0^\infty p_{\mathbf{ie}_1}(t)dt<\infty$ for all $\mathbf{i}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. By repeatedly using the Kolmogorov forward equations recursively and the irreducibility of the nonzero states, (3.4) can be easily proven. Then (3.5) immediately follows from (3.4). Finally we turn to prove (3.6). For this purpose, we shall consider two different cases separately.

First, consider the case $0<\rho(1,\cdots,1)\le\infty$. By Lemma 2.1(ii), (2.1) has a root $(q_1,q_2,\cdots,q_n)\in(0,1)^n$. Let $(\tilde{u}_1,\cdots,\tilde{u}_n)\in\prod_{i=1}^n(q_i,1)$. We claim that there exists $(\bar{u}_1,\cdots,\bar{u}_n)\in\prod_{i=1}^n[\tilde{u}_i,1)$ such that

$$B_i(\bar{u}_1,\cdots,\bar{u}_n)<0,\ \forall i=1,2,\cdots,n. \tag{3.7}$$

Indeed, let $H_1=\{i;B_i(\tilde{u}_1,\cdots,\tilde{u}_n)>0\}$. By Li and Wang [17] we know that $H_1\neq\{1,2,\cdots,n\}$ since $\rho(1,\cdots,1)>0$. If $H_1=\emptyset$ then $B_i(\tilde{u}_1,\cdots,\tilde{u}_n)\le 0$ $(\forall i=1,\cdots,n)$. If $H_1\neq\emptyset$ then by Lemma 2.2, we know that there exists $(u_1^{(1)},\cdots,u_n^{(1)})\in\prod_{i=1}^n[\tilde{u}_i,1)$ such that $B_i(u_1^{(1)},\cdots,u_n^{(1)})=0$ for all $i\in H_1$. Let

$$H_2=\{i;B_i(u_1^{(1)},\cdots,u_n^{(1)})>0\}$$

then $H_2\subset\{1,2,\cdots,n\}\setminus H_1$. It is obvious that $H_1\cup H_2\neq\{1,2,\cdots,n\}$. If $H_2=\emptyset$ then $B_i(u_1^{(1)},\cdots,u_n^{(1)})\le 0$ $(\forall i=1,\cdots,n)$. If $H_2\neq\emptyset$ then by Lemma 2.2, we know that there exists $(u_1^{(2)},\cdots,u_n^{(2)})\in\prod_{i=1}^n[u_i^{(1)},1)$ such that $B_i(u_1^{(2)},\cdots,u_n^{(2)})=0$ for all $i\in H_1\cup H_2$. By repeatedly using the same argument and noting $\{1,2,\cdots,n\}$ is a finite set, we can obtain $H_1,\ H_2,\ \cdots,H_m$ such that $H_{m+1}=\emptyset$ and hence $B_i(u_1^{(m)},\cdots,u_n^{(m)})\le 0$ $(\forall i=1,\cdots,n)$.

It is obvious that $H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_m \neq \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$, i.e, $B_i(u_1^{(m)}, \cdots, u_n^{(m)}) < 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \cdots, n\} \setminus H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_m$. By the irreducibility of nonzero states, we can see that (3.7) holds for $\bar{u}_i$ smaller than (if necessary) but closing to $u_i^{(m)}$.

By (2.2) we know that there exists $k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\} \setminus H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_m$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial F_{\mathbf{i}}(t, \bar{u}_1, \cdots, \bar{u}_n)}{\partial t} &= A(\bar{u}_1, \cdots, \bar{u}_n) \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n \setminus \mathbf{0}} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{n} B_k(\bar{u}_1, \cdots, \bar{u}_n) \frac{\partial F_{\mathbf{i}}(t, \bar{u}_1, \cdots, \bar{u}_n)}{\partial u_k}\end{aligned}$$

which implies (3.6).

Next consider the case that $\rho(1, 1, \cdots, 1) \leq 0$. Let $(\tilde{u}_1, \cdots, \tilde{u}_n) \in (0, 1)^n$. By Theorem 3.1, there exists $s \in (\tilde{u}_1, 1)$ such that $(s, u_2(s), \cdots, u_n(s)) \in \prod_{i=1}^n (\tilde{u}_i, 1)$ and hence by (2.2) and Theorem 3.1 we have

$$1 \geq A(s, u_2(s), \cdots, u_n(s)) G_{\mathbf{i}}(T, s) + B_1(s, u_2(s), \cdots, u_n(s)) \cdot \frac{\partial G_{\mathbf{i}}(T, s)}{\partial s}$$

where $G_{\mathbf{i}}(T, s) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n \setminus \mathbf{0}} (\int_0^T p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) dt) s^{j_1} u_2(s)^{j_2} \cdots u_n(s)^{j_n}$. (3.6) can be obtained immediately from the above inequality. □

For any $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}$, define

$$G_{\mathbf{i}}(u) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z_+^n} \setminus \mathbf{0}} (\int_0^\infty p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) dt) \cdot u^{j_1} [u_2(u)]^{j_2} \cdots [u_n(u)]^{j_n}. \tag{3.8}$$

From Lemma 3.1, $G_{\mathbf{i}}(u)$ is well-defined for $u \in [0, q_1)$.

Theorem 3.2. *For any $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}$, $a_{\mathbf{i0}} = 1$ if and only if $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \leq 0$ and $J = +\infty$ where*

$$J := \int_0^1 \frac{1}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx} dy. \tag{3.9}$$

More specifically,

(i) If $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \leq 0$ and $J = +\infty$, then $a_{\mathbf{i0}} = 1 (\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0})$.

(ii) If $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \leq 0$ and $J < +\infty$, then

$$a_{\mathbf{i0}} = \frac{\int_0^1 \frac{y^{i_1} [u_2(y)]^{i_2} \cdots [u_n(y)]^{i_n}}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx} dy}{\int_0^1 \frac{1}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx} dy} < 1 \tag{3.10}$$

(iii) If $0 < \rho(1, \cdots, 1) \leq +\infty$ and thus the equation (2.1) possesses a smallest nonnegative root $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, u_2(q_1), \cdots, u_n(q_1)) \in (0, 1)^n$, then

$$a_{\mathbf{i0}} = \frac{\int_0^{q_1} \frac{y^{i_1} u_2(y)^{i_2} \cdots u_n(y)^{i_n}}{B(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx} dy}{\int_0^{q_1} \frac{1}{B(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx} dy} < \prod_{k=1}^n q_k^{i_k} < 1, \quad \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

Proof. Integrating the equality (2.2) with respect to $t \in [0,\infty)$ and using Theorem 3.1, we have that for any $u \in [0,1)$ and $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & a_{\mathbf{i0}} - u^{i_1} u_2(u)^{i_2} \cdots u_n(u)^{i_n} \\ = \;& B_1(u,u_2(u),\cdots,u_n(u)) \cdot \frac{\partial F_{\mathbf{i}}(u,u_2(u),\cdots,u_n(u))}{\partial u_k} + A(u,u_2(u),\cdots,u_n(u)) \cdot G_{\mathbf{i}}(u) \\ = \;& B_1(u,u_2(u),\cdots,u_n(u)) \cdot G'_{\mathbf{i}}(u) + A(u,u_2(u),\cdots,u_n(u)) \cdot G_{\mathbf{i}}(u) \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where $G_{\mathbf{i}}(u) < +\infty$ is given in (3.6). First consider the case $\rho(1,\cdots,1) \leq 0$. Solving the ordinary differential equation (3.11) for $u \in [0,1)$ immediately yields

$$\begin{aligned} & G_{\mathbf{i}}(u) \cdot e^{\int_0^u \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} \\ = \;& \int_0^u \frac{a_{\mathbf{i0}} - y^{i_1} u_2(y)^{i_2} \cdots u_n(y)^{i_n}}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

This immediately implies that if $J = +\infty$, then $a_{\mathbf{i0}} = 1$. Indeed, if $a_{\mathbf{i0}} < 1$, then by letting $s \uparrow 1$ in (3.12) we see that the right hand side of (3.12) tends to $-\infty$, while the left hand side is always nonnegative, which is a contradiction. Hence (i) is proven.

Now we turn to (ii). First note that $J < +\infty$ implies $\int_0^1 \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx = -\infty$. Since the left hand side of (3.12) is clearly nonnegative and thus so is the right hand side of (3.12). It follows that $a_{\mathbf{i0}} \geq J^{-1} \cdot \int_0^1 \frac{y^{i_1} u_2(y)^{i_2} \cdots u_n(y)^{i_n}}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy$. Therefore, in order to prove (ii), we only need to show that

$$a_{\mathbf{i0}} \leq J^{-1} \cdot \int_0^1 \frac{y^{i_1} u_2(y)^{i_2} \cdots u_n(y)^{i_n}}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy.$$

Take $x^*_{\mathbf{j}} = J^{-1} \cdot \int_0^1 \frac{y^{j_1} u_2(y)^{j_2} \cdots u_n(y)^{j_n}}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy, \mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{0}$, then for any $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{j}\neq\mathbf{0}} q_{\mathbf{ij}} x^*_{\mathbf{j}} + q_{\mathbf{i0}} \\ = \;& J^{-1} \cdot \int_0^1 \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}^n_+} q_{\mathbf{ij}} \cdot y^{j_1} u_2(y)^{j_2} \cdots u_n(y)^{j_n}}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy \\ = \;& J^{-1} \cdot \int_0^1 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} i_k y^{i_1} u_2(y)^{i_2} \cdots u_k(y)^{i_k-1} u'_k(y) \cdots u_n(y)^{j_n} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy \\ & + J^{-1} \cdot \int_0^1 \frac{y^{j_1} u_2(y)^{j_2} \cdots u_n(y)^{j_n} A(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy \\ = \;& 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here the last equality follows from applying the method of integration by parts. Hence $(x^*_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{0})$ is a solution of the equation

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j}\neq\mathbf{0}} q_{\mathbf{ij}} x^*_{\mathbf{j}} + q_{\mathbf{i0}} = 0, \quad 0 \leq x^*_{\mathbf{j}} \leq 1, \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

By Lemma 3.2 in Li and Chen [16], we then have $a_{\mathbf{i0}} \le x^*_{\mathbf{i}} (\mathbf{i} \ne \mathbf{0})$ since $a_{\mathbf{i0}}$ is the minimal solution of the above equation. (ii) is proved.

Finally, we consider (iii). Suppose that $0 < \rho(1, \cdots, 1) \le +\infty$. By Lemma 2.1, we know that the equation (2.1) has a root $(q_1, u_2(q_1), \cdots, u_n(q_1)) \in (0,1)^n$ and $G_{\mathbf{i}}(s) < \infty$ for all $s \in [0, q_1]$. Similarly as in the above, we only need to show that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\mathbf{i0}} \;\le\; & \lim_{s \uparrow q_1} [\int_0^s \frac{1}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx} dy]^{-1} \cdot \\ & \int_0^s \frac{y^{j_1} u_2(y)^{j_2} \cdots u_n(y)^{j_n}}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Since $-a_{\mathbf{0}} > 0$, we know by Lemma 2.1 that $\int_0^{q_1} \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx = -\infty$ and

$$\int_0^y \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx \le \int_0^y \frac{A(q_1, q_2, \cdots, q_n)}{B_1(x, q_2, \cdots, q_n)} dx \le C \ln \frac{q_1 - y}{q_1}$$

for $y \in [0, q_1)$, where C is a positive constant. Hence the integral $\int_0^{q_1} \frac{1}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx} dy$, denoted by D, is convergent. Now by letting

$$y^*_{\mathbf{j}} = D^{-1} \cdot \int_0^{q_1} \frac{1}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx} dy, \quad \mathbf{j} \ne \mathbf{0},$$

we may prove similarly as above that $(y^*_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \ne \mathbf{0})$ is a solution of the equation

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j} \ne \mathbf{0}} q_{\mathbf{ij}} x^*_{\mathbf{j}} + q_{\mathbf{i0}} = 0, \quad 0 \le x^*_{\mathbf{j}} \le 1, \mathbf{i} \ne \mathbf{0}.$$

Again by Lemma 3.2 in Li and Chen [16], we have $a_{\mathbf{i0}} \le y^*_{\mathbf{i}} (\mathbf{i} \ne \mathbf{0})$ which proves the first equality in (3.5). The last two assertions in (3.5) are obvious. □

By Theorem 3.2, we see that when immigration occurs then the condition $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \le 0$(i.e., the death rate is greater than or equal to the mean birth rate) is no longer sufficient, though still necessary, for the process to be finally extinct. A further condition $J = \infty$, which reflects the effect of immigration, is necessary to guarantee the final extinction.

Having obtained the extinction probability, we are now in a position to consider the extinction time. We shall use $E_{\mathbf{i}}[\tau_0]$ to denote the mean extinction time when the process starts at state $\mathbf{i} \ne \mathbf{0}$.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \le 0$ and $J = \infty$ where J is given in* (3.9) *and thus the extinction probability $a_{\mathbf{i0}} = 1 (\mathbf{i} \ne \mathbf{0})$. Then for any $\mathbf{i} \ne \mathbf{0}$, $E_{\mathbf{i}}[\tau_0] < \infty$ if and only if*

$$\int_0^1 \frac{1 - y u_2(y) \cdots u_n(y) - A(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} dy < \infty \tag{3.13}$$

and in which case, $E_{\mathbf{i}}[\tau_0]$ is given by

$$E_{\mathbf{i}}[\tau_0] = \int_0^1 \frac{1 - y^{i_1} u_2(y)^{i_2} \cdots u_n(y)^{i_n}}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{-\int_y^1 \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx} dy. \tag{3.14}$$

Proof. It follows from (3.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{j}\neq\mathbf{0}}\Big(\int_0^\infty p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)dt\Big)\cdot u^{j_1}u_2(u)^{j_2}\cdots u_n(u)^{j_n} \\ = & \int_0^u \frac{1-y^{i_1}u_2(y)^{i_2}\cdots u_n(y)^{i_n}}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}\cdot e^{-\int_y^s \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}dy \end{aligned}$$

Letting $s\uparrow 1$, using the honesty condition and applying the Monotone Convergence Theorem then yields

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbf{i}}[\tau_0] &= \int_0^\infty (1-p_{\mathbf{i0}}(t))dt \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n\setminus\mathbf{0}}\int_0^\infty p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{1-y^{i_1}u_2(y)^{i_2}\cdots u_n(y)^{i_n}}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}\cdot e^{-\int_y^1 \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}dy \end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.14) is proved. Finally, it is fairly easy to show that the expression in (3.14) is finite if and only if (3.13) holds. □

4. Recurrence Property

Unlike the previous section, in this section we shall always assume that $h_{\mathbf{0}}<0$ and thus $\mathbf{0}$ is no longer an absorbing state. For this case, the most important problem is the recurrence property. We shall assume that the nTBI q-matrix Q is regular and thus the nTBIP is honest.

Theorem 4.1. *The nTBIP is recurrent if and only if $\rho(1,\cdots,1)\le 0$ and $J=+\infty$, where J is given in* (3.9).

Proof. We first prove the "if" part. By Lemma 4.46 of Chen [6], it is sufficient to prove that the minimal solution of the equation

$$x_{\mathbf{i}}=\sum_{\mathbf{j}\neq\mathbf{0}}\tilde{\pi}_{\mathbf{ij}}x_{\mathbf{j}}+\tilde{\pi}_{\mathbf{i0}},\quad \mathbf{i}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n, \tag{4.1}$$

equals 1 identically, where $(\tilde{\pi}_{\mathbf{ij}};\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ denote the transition probability of the embedding chain of the nTBIP. Denote

$$\pi_{\mathbf{ij}}=\begin{cases}\delta_{\mathbf{0j}}, & \text{if } \mathbf{i}=\mathbf{0},\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n\\ \tilde{\pi}_{\mathbf{ij}}, & \text{if } \mathbf{i}\neq\mathbf{0},\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n.\end{cases}$$

If $(x_{\mathbf{i}}^*;\mathbf{i}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is the minimal solution of the (4.1), then it is easy to see that $(x_{\mathbf{i}}^*;\mathbf{i}\neq\mathbf{0})$ is a solution of the equation

$$x_{\mathbf{i}}=\sum_{\mathbf{j}\neq\mathbf{0}}\pi_{\mathbf{ij}}x_{\mathbf{j}}+\pi_{\mathbf{i0}},\quad 0\le x_{\mathbf{i}}\le 1,\mathbf{i}\neq\mathbf{0}.$$

Indeed, by Lemma 3.2 of Li and Chen [16] and Theorem 3.2 we immediately see that $x^*_{\mathbf{i}} = a_{\mathbf{i0}} = 1(\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0})$ and hence $x^*_{\mathbf{i}} = 1(\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}^n_+)$. Therefore, by the Anderson[15], we know that the nTBIP is recurrent.

We now prove the "only if" part. Assume that either $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \leq 0$ together $J < +\infty$ or $0 < \rho(1, \cdots, 1) \leq +\infty$. We shall prove that the process is transient. To this end, it is sufficient to show that the equation

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}^n_+} \pi_{\mathbf{ij}} x_{\mathbf{j}} = x_{\mathbf{i}}, \quad \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0},$$

has a non-constant bounded solution. By the Comparison Lemma, we only need to show that the inequality

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}^n_+} \pi_{\mathbf{ij}} x_{\mathbf{j}} \geq x_{\mathbf{i}}, \quad \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}, \tag{4.2}$$

has a non-constant bounded solution. Now if $0 < \rho(1, \cdots, 1) \leq \infty$, By Lemma 2.2, we know that the equation (2.1) has a root $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \cdots, q_n) \in (0, 1)^n$. Let $x_{\mathbf{i}} = 1 - \mathbf{q}^{\mathbf{i}}$, then $(x_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}^n_+)$ is a non-constant bounded solution of (4.2). Indeed, for $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}^n_+} \pi_{\mathbf{ij}} x_{\mathbf{j}} \\
= \;& \frac{1}{-\sum_{k=1}^n i_k b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{e}_k} - a_{\mathbf{0}}} [\sum_{\mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{i}} \sum_{k=1}^n i_k b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+e_k} (1 - \mathbf{q}^{\mathbf{j}}) + \sum_{\mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{i}} a_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}} (1 - \mathbf{q}^{\mathbf{j}})] \\
= \;& \frac{1}{-\sum_{k=1}^n i_k b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{e}_k} - a_{\mathbf{0}}} [-\sum_{k=1}^n i_k b^{(k)}_{e_k} - a_{\mathbf{0}} + \sum_{k=1}^n i_k b^{(k)}_{e_k} \mathbf{q}^{\mathbf{i}} - \mathbf{q}^{\mathbf{i}} (A(\mathbf{q}) - a_{\mathbf{0}})] \\
= \;& 1 - \mathbf{q}^{\mathbf{i}} + \frac{-\mathbf{q}^{\mathbf{i}} A(\mathbf{q})}{-\sum_{k=1}^n i_k b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{e}_k} - a_{\mathbf{0}}} \\
\geq \;& 1 - \mathbf{q}^{\mathbf{i}} = x_{\mathbf{i}}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \leq 0$ and $J = +\infty$, then by letting

$$x^*_{\mathbf{j}} = J^{-1} \int_0^1 \frac{y^{i_1} u_2(y)^{i_2} \cdots u_n(y)^{i_n}}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))}{B_1(x, u_2(x), \cdots, u_n(x))} dx} dy, \quad \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}^n_+,$$

we may easily verify as in the proof of Theorem 3.2 that $(x^*_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}^n_+)$ is a non-constant bounded solution of (4.2). □

Theorem 4.2. *The nTBIP is positive recurrent (i.e., ergodic) if and only if $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \leq 0$ and*

$$\int_0^1 \frac{-A(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y)) - H(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} dy < \infty. \tag{4.3}$$

Moreover, if $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) < 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n [A_j(1, \cdots, 1) + H_j(1, \cdots, 1)] < \infty$, then the process is exponentially ergodic.

Proof. Suppose that $\rho(1,\cdots,1)\le 0$ and (4.3) holds. By Chen [6], in order to prove the positive recurrence, we only need to show that the equation

$$\begin{cases}\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} q_{\mathbf{ij}}y_{\mathbf{j}}\le -1, & \mathbf{i}\neq\mathbf{0},\\ \sum_{\mathbf{j}\neq\mathbf{0}} q_{\mathbf{0j}}y_{\mathbf{j}}<\infty\end{cases}$$

has a finite nonnegative solution. By the irreducibility property and the fact that $\rho(1,\cdots,1)\le 0$, we may get from (4.3) that

$$\int_0^1 \frac{1-y^{i_1}u_2(y)^{i_2}\cdots u_n(y)^{i_n}}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}\cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}dy<\infty,\quad \mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n.$$

Indeed, since $h_{\mathbf{0}}<0$, it is easy to see that there exists a positive constant L such that $1-yu_2(y)\cdots u_n(y)\le L\cdot H(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))$, which implies that

$$\int_0^1 \frac{1-y^{j_1}u_2(y)^{j_2}\cdots u_n(y)^{j_n}}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}dy<\infty$$

for any $\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Now let

$$y_{\mathbf{j}}=e^{-\int_0^1 \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}\cdot\int_0^1 \frac{1-y^{j_1}u_2(y)^{j_2}\cdots u_n(y)^{j_n}}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}\cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}dy,\quad \mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n,$$

then $0\le y_{\mathbf{j}}<\infty(\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ and for any $\mathbf{i}\neq\mathbf{0}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} q_{\mathbf{ij}}y_{\mathbf{j}}\\ =\;& e^{-\int_0^1 \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}\cdot\int_0^1 \frac{-\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} q_{\mathbf{ij}}y^{j_1}u_2(y)^{j_2}\cdots u_n(y)^{j_n}}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}\cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}dy\\ =\;& e^{-\int_0^1 \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}\cdot\int_0^1 [\frac{-f(y)A(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}-f'(y)]\cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}dy\\ =\;& -1\end{aligned}$$

where $f(y)=y^{i_1}u_2(y)^{i_2}\cdots u_n(y)^{i_n}$. As to $\mathbf{i}=\mathbf{0}$, it is easy to see that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j}\neq\mathbf{0}} q_{\mathbf{0j}}y_{\mathbf{j}}\le e^{-\int_0^1 \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}\cdot\int_0^1 \frac{-H(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}dy<\infty.$$

Therefore the nTBIP is positive recurrent.

Conversely, suppose that the process is positive recurrent and thus possesses and equilibrium distribution $(\pi_{\mathbf{j}};\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n)$, that is

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)=\pi_{\mathbf{j}}>0\ \text{ and }\ \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n}\pi_{\mathbf{j}}=1.$$

Letting $t\to\infty$ in (2.2) and using the Dominated Convergence Theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned}&H(s,u_2(s),\cdots,u_n(s))\pi_{\mathbf{0}}+A(s,u_2(s),\cdots,u_n(s))\sum_{\mathbf{j}\neq\mathbf{0}}\pi_{\mathbf{j}}s^{j_1}u_2(s)^{j_2}\cdots u_n(s)^{j_n}\\ +\;&\sum_{k=1}^n B_k(s,u_2(s),\cdots,u_n(s))\sum_{\mathbf{j}\neq\mathbf{0}}\pi_{\mathbf{j}}j_k s^{j_1}u_2(s)^{j_2}\cdots u_k(s)^{j_k-1}\cdots u_n(s)^{j_n}=0,\end{aligned}\qquad(4.4)$$

for $s \in [0,1)$.

Note that (4.4) implies that $\rho(1,\cdots,1) \le 0$. Indeed, since $H(s,u_2(s),\cdots,u_n(s)) < 0$ and $A(s,u_2(s),\cdots,u_n(s)) < 0$ for all $s \in [0,1)$, which, by the proof of Theorem 3.1, implies that $\rho(1,\cdots,1) \le 0$. Denote $\pi(s) = \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} \pi_{\mathbf{j}} s^{j_1} u_2(s)^{j_2}\cdots u_n(s)^{j_n}$, then (4.4) can be written as

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} B_k(s,u_2(s),\cdots,u_n(s))\pi'(s) + A(s,u_2(s),\cdots,u_n(s))\pi(s) + \pi_{\mathbf{0}}[H(s,u_2(s),\cdots,u_n(s))$$
$$-A(s,u_2(s),\cdots,u_n(s))] = 0, \quad s \in [0,1),$$

and hence

$$\pi(s) = \pi_{\mathbf{0}}[1 + \int_0^s \frac{-H(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \cdot e^{-\int_y^s \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy], \quad s \in [0,1) \tag{4.5}$$

Letting $s \uparrow 1$ in (4.5) yields

$$\lim_{s\uparrow 1} \frac{\int_0^s \frac{-H(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy}{e^{\int_0^s \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}} < \infty.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^s \frac{-H(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy \\ \ge & \int_0^{s_0} \frac{-H(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy \\ > & 0 \end{aligned}$$

for some $s_0 \in (0,1)$ as $s \uparrow 1$, we must have $\int_0^1 \frac{-A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx < \infty$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{s\uparrow 1} \int_0^s \frac{-H(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \\ \le & \lim_{s\uparrow 1} \frac{\int_0^s \frac{-H(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))}{B_1(y,u_2(y),\cdots,u_n(y))} \cdot e^{\int_0^y \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy}{e^{\int_0^s \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx}} \\ < & \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (4.3) holds, which completes the proof of the first part.

Now suppose that $\rho(1,\cdots,1) < 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n [A_j(1,\cdots,1) + H_j(1,\cdots,1)] < \infty$. We prove that the nTBIP is exponentially ergodic. By Corollary 4.49 of Chen [6], it is sufficient to show that there exist two constants $C_1 \ge 0$, $C_2 > 0$ and a finite nonnegative function $(f_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ with $\lim_{\mathbf{i}\to\infty} f_{\mathbf{i}} = +\infty$ such that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} q_{\mathbf{ij}}(f_{\mathbf{j}} - f_{\mathbf{i}}) \le C_1 - C_2 f_{\mathbf{i}}, \quad \mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n.$$

Since $\rho(1,\cdots,1)$ has a positive eigenvector $(x_1,\cdots,x_n)$, let

$$C_1 = (\sum_{j=1}^n A_j(1,\cdots,1)) \vee (\sum_{j=1}^n H_j(1,\cdots,1)) \cdot \max\{x_1,\cdots,x_n\} > 0,$$

$$C_2 = -\rho(1, \cdots, 1) > 0$$

and $f_{\mathbf{i}} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k x_k$ ($\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$). Then for any $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} q_{\mathbf{ij}}(f_{\mathbf{j}} - f_{\mathbf{i}}) \\
=\ & \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+e_k}(f_{\mathbf{j}} - f_{\mathbf{i}}) + \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{0}} h_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}} + (1-\delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{0}})a_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}})(f_{\mathbf{j}} - f_{\mathbf{i}}) \\
=\ & \sum_{k=1}^{n}\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n}\sum_{l=1}^{n} i_k b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+e_k}(j_l - i_l)x_l + \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n}\sum_{l=1}^{n}(\delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{0}} h_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}} + (1-\delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{0}})a_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}})(j_l - i_l)x_l \\
=\ & \sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k \sum_{l=1}^{n} B_{kl}(1, \cdots, 1)x_l + \sum_{k=1}^{n}(\delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{0}} H_l(1, \cdots, 1) + (1-\delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{0}})A_l(1, \cdots, 1) \\
\le\ & C_1 - C_2 f_{\mathbf{i}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the proof is complete. □

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that the nTBIP is positive recurrent. Then its equilibrium distribution $(\pi_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is given by*

$$\pi(s) = \pi_{\mathbf{0}}[1 + \int_0^s \frac{-H(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))}{B_1(y, u_2(y), \cdots, u_n(y))} \cdot e^{-\int_y^s \frac{A(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}{B_1(x,u_2(x),\cdots,u_n(x))}dx} dy], \quad s \in [0, 1) \tag{4.6}$$

where $\pi(s) = \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} \pi_{\mathbf{j}} s^{j_1} u_2(s)^{j_2} \cdots u_n(s)^{j_n}$.

Proof. (4.6) follows directly from the proof of Theorem 4.2(see (4.5)). □

Finally, we have the following conclusion which follows immediately from Theorem 3.3.

Theorem 4.4. *The nTBIP is never strongly ergodic.*

5. Branching Property

In the following two sections, we will consider the branching property and the decay property. For this purpose, we shall assume that $h_{\mathbf{j}} = a_{\mathbf{j}}$, i.e., the q-matrix takes the following form:

$$q_{\mathbf{ij}} = \begin{cases} a_{\mathbf{j}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| = 0 \\ \sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{e}_k) + a_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{i}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} a_{\mathbf{j}} \ge 0 (\mathbf{j} \ne \mathbf{0}), 0 < \sum_{\mathbf{j}\ne\mathbf{0}} a_{\mathbf{j}} \le -a_{\mathbf{0}} < \infty; \\ b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{j}} \ge 0\ (\mathbf{j} \ne \mathbf{e}_k),\ 0 < \sum_{\mathbf{j}\ne\mathbf{e}_k} b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{j}} \le -b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{e}_k} < \infty, \quad k = 1, \cdots, n. \end{cases} \tag{5.2}$$

It is well-known that n-type Markov branching process possesses branching property. We now discuss the similar property of nTBIP, the following theorem reveals that nTBIP also possesses the branching property if the resurrection is same as the immigration.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $P(t) = (p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ be a transition function. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(i) $P(t)$ is the Feller minimal Q-function, where Q takes the form of (5.1) − (5.2).

(ii) For any $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$, $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{s} \in [-1, 1]^n$, we have

$$F_{\mathbf{i}}(t, \mathbf{s}) = F_{\mathbf{0}}(t, \mathbf{s}) \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{n} (\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \tilde{p}_{\mathbf{e}_k \mathbf{j}}(t) \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{j}})^{i_k} \tag{5.3}$$

where $F_{\mathbf{i}}(t, \mathbf{s}) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{j}}$ $(\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n, \mathbf{s} \in [-1, 1]^n)$ and $(\tilde{p}_{\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{j}}(t); \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is the Feller minimal $\tilde{Q}$-function and $\tilde{Q}$ is an n-type ordinary branching q-matrix (but may not be conservative).

(iii) For any $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$, $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{s} \in [-1, 1]^n$, we have

$$F_{\mathbf{i}}(t, \mathbf{s}) = F_{\mathbf{0}}(t, \mathbf{s}) \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{n} (F_{\mathbf{e}_k}(t, \mathbf{s}) / F_{\mathbf{0}}(t, \mathbf{s}))^{i_k}. \tag{5.4}$$

In particular,

$$p_{\mathbf{i0}}(t) = p_{\mathbf{00}}(t) \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{n} (p_{\mathbf{e}_k \mathbf{0}}(t) / p_{\mathbf{00}}(t))^{i_k}, \quad |\mathbf{i}| \geq 1 \tag{5.5}$$

Proof. $(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$ is trivial and thus omitted. Therefore, we only need to prove $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ and $(iii) \Rightarrow (i)$. Note the fact that $B(1, \cdots, 1) \leq 0$ always holds no matter Q is conservative or not. We first prove $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$. If (i) holds, then $P(t)$ as the Feller minimal Q-function, satisfies the Kolmogorov forward equation $P'(t) = P(t)Q$. We now prove (5.3). Let $\tilde{Q} = (\tilde{q}_{\mathbf{ij}}; \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ be defined as follows:

$$\tilde{q}_{\mathbf{ij}} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^{n} i_k b_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k}^{(k)} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{e}_k), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| > 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $(\tilde{p}_{\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{j}}(t); \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is the Feller minimal $\tilde{Q}$-function. Then by Athreya [5], we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \tilde{p}_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{j}} = \prod_{k=1}^{n} (\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \tilde{p}_{\mathbf{e}_k \mathbf{j}}(t) \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{j}})^{i_k}.$$

Now define $\hat{P}(t) = (\hat{p}_{\mathbf{ij}}(t); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ by

$$\hat{p}_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{j}} p_{\mathbf{0k}}(t) \tilde{p}_{\mathbf{ij}-\mathbf{k}}(t).$$

It is easily seen that $\hat{P}(t)$ is a Q-function. We now show that $\hat{P}(t)$ satisfies the Kolmogorov forward equation $\hat{P}'(t) = \hat{P}(t)Q$. Denote $\hat{F}_{\mathbf{i}}(t, \mathbf{s}) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \hat{p}_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{j}}$, then

$$\hat{F}_{\mathbf{i}}(t, \mathbf{s}) = F_{\mathbf{0}}(t, \mathbf{s}) \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{n} (\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \tilde{p}_{\mathbf{e}_k \mathbf{j}}(t) \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{j}})^{i_k}, \quad \mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n.$$

Now we claim that $\hat{F}_{\mathbf{i}}(t,\mathbf{s})$ satisfies (5.3). Note that

$$\frac{\partial F_{\mathbf{0}}(t,\mathbf{s})}{\partial t}=\sum_{k=1}^{n}B_k(\mathbf{s})\frac{\partial F_{\mathbf{0}}(t,\mathbf{s})}{\partial s_k}+A(\mathbf{s})F_{\mathbf{0}}(t,\mathbf{s})$$

it can be easily seen that $\hat{F}_{\mathbf{i}}(t,\mathbf{s})$ satisfies

$$\frac{\partial \hat{F}_{\mathbf{i}}(t,\mathbf{s})}{\partial t}=\sum_{k=1}^{n}B_k(\mathbf{s})\frac{\partial \hat{F}_{\mathbf{i}}(t,\mathbf{s})}{\partial s_k}+A(\mathbf{s})\hat{F}_{\mathbf{i}}(t,\mathbf{s}),\quad \mathbf{i}\neq\mathbf{0}$$

which implies that $\hat{P}'(t)=\hat{P}(t)Q$. By Theorem 2.1, we must have $\hat{P}(t)=P(t)$ and hence (5.3) holds. (ii) is proved.

Next we prove $(iii)\Rightarrow(i)$. First note that (5.4) implies that $F_{\mathbf{e}_k}(t,\mathbf{s})\leq F_{\mathbf{0}}(t,\mathbf{s})$ for all $t>0$ and $\mathbf{s}\in(0,1)^n$. We now further claim that there exist $\tilde{t}>0$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}\in(0,1)^n$ such that

$$F_{\mathbf{e}_k}(\tilde{t},\tilde{\mathbf{s}})<F_{\mathbf{0}}(\tilde{t},\tilde{\mathbf{s}})$$

Indeed, suppose the converse is true, then $F_{\mathbf{e}_k}(t,\mathbf{s})=F_{\mathbf{0}}(t,\mathbf{s})$ for all $t>0$ and $\mathbf{s}\in(0,1)^n$. It follows that $F_{\mathbf{e}_k}(t,\mathbf{s})=F_{\mathbf{0}}(t,\mathbf{s})$ holds even for all $t\geq 0$ and $\mathbf{s}\in[0,1]^n$ since both $F_{\mathbf{e}_k}(t,\mathbf{s})$ and $F_{\mathbf{0}}(t,\mathbf{s})$ are continuous functions of $t\geq 0$ and $\mathbf{s}\in[0,1]^n$. Hence,

$$p_{\mathbf{e}_k\mathbf{j}}(t)=p_{\mathbf{0}\mathbf{j}}(t),\quad t\geq 0,\quad \mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n$$

which contradicts with the fact that $\lim_{t\downarrow 0}p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)=\delta_{\mathbf{ij}}$.

Now, it follows from (5.4) and $F_{\mathbf{e}_k}(\tilde{t},\tilde{\mathbf{s}})<F_{\mathbf{0}}(\tilde{t},\tilde{\mathbf{s}})$ that

$$\lim_{\mathbf{i}\to\infty}F_{\mathbf{i}}(\tilde{t},\tilde{\mathbf{s}})=0$$

which implies that $\lim_{\mathbf{i}\to\infty}p_{\mathbf{ij}}(\tilde{t})=0$ for all $\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Therefore $P(t)=(p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t);\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is a Feller-Reuter-Riley transition function. By Anderson (1991), we know that the corresponding q-matrix $Q=(q_{\mathbf{ij}};\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is stable and furthermore $P(t)$ is the Feller minimal Q-function. Now, we rewrite (5.4) as

$$F_{\mathbf{i}}(t,\mathbf{s})\cdot\prod_{k=1}^{n}F_{\mathbf{0}}^{i_k}(t,\mathbf{s})=F_{\mathbf{0}}(t,\mathbf{s})\cdot\prod_{k=1}^{n}F_{\mathbf{e}_k}^{i_k}(t,\mathbf{s})$$

Denoting $b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(k)}=q_{\mathbf{e}_k\mathbf{0}}(k=1,\cdots,n)$ and $y_{\mathbf{j}}=q_{\mathbf{0}\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n)$. Differentiating the above equality with respect to t and letting $t=0$ yields that for any $\mathbf{i}\neq\mathbf{0}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&F_{\mathbf{i}}'(0,\mathbf{s})\cdot\textstyle\prod_{k=1}^{n}F_{\mathbf{0}}^{i_k}(0,\mathbf{s})+F_{\mathbf{i}}(0,\mathbf{s})\cdot\sum_{l=1}^{n}\frac{\prod_{k=1}^{n}F_{\mathbf{0}}^{i_k}(0,\mathbf{s})}{F_{\mathbf{0}}(0,\mathbf{s})}\cdot i_l\cdot F_{\mathbf{0}}'(0,\mathbf{s})\\ =\;&F_{\mathbf{0}}'(0,\mathbf{s})\cdot\textstyle\prod_{k=1}^{n}F_{\mathbf{e}_k}^{i_k}(0,\mathbf{s})+F_{\mathbf{0}}(0,\mathbf{s})\cdot\sum_{l=1}^{n}\frac{\prod_{k=1}^{n}F_{\mathbf{e}_k}^{i_k}(0,\mathbf{s})}{F_{\mathbf{e}_l}(0,\mathbf{s})}\cdot i_l\cdot F_{\mathbf{e}_l}'(0,\mathbf{s})\end{aligned}$$

where $F_{\mathbf{i}}'(t,\mathbf{s})=\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n}p_{\mathbf{ij}}'(t)\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{j}}$. Hence,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n}q_{\mathbf{ij}}\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{j}}=-(\sum_{k=1}^{n}i_k-1)\cdot\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n}y_{\mathbf{j}}\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{j}+\mathbf{i}}+\sum_{k=1}^{n}i_k\cdot\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n}q_{\mathbf{e}_k\mathbf{j}}\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{j}+\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{e}_k}$$

Comparing the coefficients of $\mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{j}}$ on both sides of the above equality yields

$$q_{\mathbf{ij}} = \begin{cases} y_{\mathbf{j}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| = 0 \\ \sum_{k=1}^n i_k (q_{\mathbf{e}_k\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k} - y_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}}) \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k) + y_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Noting the fact $q_{\mathbf{ij}} \geq 0$ ($\sum_{k=1}^n i_k > 0, \mathbf{j} > \mathbf{i}$) and $q_{\mathbf{ii}} \leq 0$ we can see that

$$b_{\mathbf{e}_k}^{(k)} := q_{\mathbf{e}_k\mathbf{e}_k} - y_{\mathbf{0}} \leq 0, \quad b_{\mathbf{j}+\mathbf{e}_k}^{(k)} := q_{\mathbf{e}_k\mathbf{j}+\mathbf{e}_k} - y_{\mathbf{j}} \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{j} > \mathbf{0}.$$

Hence,

$$q_{\mathbf{ij}} = \begin{cases} y_{\mathbf{j}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| = 0 \\ \sum_{k=1}^n i_k b_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k}^{(k)} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k) + y_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Comparing this with (5.1) implies that Q takes the form of (5.1) with $a_{\mathbf{j}} = y_{\mathbf{j}} (\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$. Finally, general theory of continuous-time Markov chain yields

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{0}} y_{\mathbf{j}} \leq -y_{\mathbf{0}} < +\infty, \quad \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} (y_{\mathbf{j}} + \sum_{k=1}^n i_k b_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k}^{(k)}) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} q_{\mathbf{ij}} \leq 0$$

and hence

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{e}_k} b_{\mathbf{j}}^{(k)} \leq -b_{\mathbf{e}_k}^{(k)} < +\infty.$$

Thus Q takes the form of $(4.1) - (4.2)$ with $a_{\mathbf{j}} \equiv y_{\mathbf{j}} (\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$(but may not be conservative). □

6. Decay Property

In the previous section, we considered branching property in the case that $h_{\mathbf{j}} = a_{\mathbf{j}}$. We now discuss the decay parameter λ_Z and related property in such case.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose that $G(1, \cdots, 1)$ is positively regular, $\{B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n); i = 1, \cdots, n\}$ is nonsingular and $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$ is a communicating class. Then*

$$\lambda_Z \geq -A(q_1, \cdots, q_n),$$

where $(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ is the minimal nonnegative solution of (2.1) given in Lemma 2.2.

Proof. In order to prove $\lambda_Z \geq -A(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$, it follows from Proposition 5.4.1 in Anderson [1], we only need to show that there exists a $-A(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$-subinvariant vector for Q on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. In other words, we only need to show that there exists a positive $(y_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ such that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n \setminus \mathbf{0}} q_{\mathbf{jk}}\, y_{\mathbf{k}} \leq A(q_1, \cdots, q_n) y_{\mathbf{j}}, \quad \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n.$$

By Lemma 2.2, we know that equation (2.1) has a smallest nonnegative solution $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \cdots, q_n) \in [0,1]^n$. Note that $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$ is a communicating class, we further have $\mathbf{q} \in (0,1]^n$.

Define

$$y_k = q_1^{k_1} \cdots q_n^{k_n}, \quad \mathbf{k} = (k_1, \cdots, k_n) \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n.$$

Then $y_{\mathbf{k}} > 0, \ \forall \mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} q_{\mathbf{0k}}\ y_{\mathbf{k}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} a_{\mathbf{k}} q_1^{k_1} \cdots q_n^{k_n} = A(q_1, \cdots, q_n) = A(q_1, \cdots, q_n) y_{\mathbf{0}}.$$

For $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n \setminus \mathbf{0}, i = 1, \cdots, n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} q_{\mathbf{jk}} y_{\mathbf{k}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} (\sum_{i=1}^n j_i b^{(i)}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{j}+\mathbf{e}_i}) q_1^{k_1} \cdots q_n^{k_n} + \sum_{\mathbf{k}\geq\mathbf{j}} a_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{j}} q_1^{k_1} \cdots q_n^{k_n} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n B_i(q_1, \cdots, q_n) j_i q_1^{j_1} \cdots q_i^{j_i - 1} \cdots q_n^{k_n} + A(q_1, \cdots, q_n) q_1^{j_1} \cdots q_n^{j_n} \\
&= A(q_1, \cdots, q_n) y_{\mathbf{j}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Which implies that $(y_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is a $-A(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$-invariant vector for Q on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Therefore, $\lambda_Z \geq -A(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$. □

Theorem 6.1 gives a low-bound of the decay parameter. The following theorem further presents the exact value of the decay parameter.

Theorem 6.2. *Suppose $G(1, \cdots, 1)$ is positively regular, $\{B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n); i = 1, \cdots, n\}$ is nonsingular and $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$ is a communicating class. Then*

$$\lambda_Z = -A(q_1, \cdots, q_n),$$

where $(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ is the minimal nonnegative solution of (2.1) given in Lemma 2.2.

Proof. By Theorem 6.1, we only need to prove $\lambda_Z \leq -A(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1, we still have $q_1, \cdots, q_n > 0$. It follows from the Kolmogorov forward equation that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial t} F_{\mathbf{j}}(u_1, \cdots, u_n, t) \\
=&\sum_{i=1}^n B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i} F_{\mathbf{j}}(u_1, \cdots, u_n, t) + A(u_1, \cdots, u_n) F_{\mathbf{j}}(u_1, \cdots, u_n, t)
\end{aligned}$$

where $F_{\mathbf{j}}(u_1, \cdots, u_n, t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{jk}}(t) u_1^{k_1} \cdots u_n^{k_n}, u_1, \cdots, u_n \in (-1, 1)$.

If $(q_1, \cdots, q_n) < \mathbf{1}$. Define

$$\hat{p}_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) = e^{-A(q_1, \cdots, q_n)t} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) \frac{q_1^{j_1} \cdots q_n^{j_n}}{q_1^{i_1} \cdots q_n^{i_n}}, \quad \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n, t \geq 0. \tag{6.1}$$

Then by Pollett [21], we know that $\hat{P}(t) = (\hat{p}_{\mathbf{ij}}(t); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is a stationary and honest transition function on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Moreover, it is easy to see that its q-matrix $\hat{Q} = (\hat{q}_{\mathbf{ij}}; \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is given by

$$\hat{q}_{\mathbf{ij}} = \begin{cases} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{j}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| = 0 \\ \sum_{k=1}^n i_k \hat{b}^{(k)}_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k) + \hat{a}_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\hat{a}_{\mathbf{j}} = a_{\mathbf{j}} q_1^{j_1} \cdots q_n^{j_n} - A(q_1, \cdots, q_n)\delta_{\mathbf{0j}}, \quad \hat{b}^{(i)}_{\mathbf{j}} = b^{(i)}_{\mathbf{j}} q_1^{j_1} \cdots q_n^{j_n}, \quad (\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$$

Obviously, $\hat{Q}$ is a conservative nTBI q-matrix. Let

$$\hat{A}(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \hat{a}^{(i)}_{\mathbf{j}} u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n}$$
$$\hat{B}_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \hat{b}^{(i)}_{\mathbf{j}} u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n}, \quad (i = 1, \cdots, n)$$

then

$$\hat{A}(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = A(q_1 u_1, \cdots, q_n u_n) - A(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$$
$$\hat{B}_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = B_i(q_1 u_1, \cdots, q_n u_n) \quad (i = 1, \cdots, n)$$

and

$$\hat{B}_i(1, \cdots, 1) = \hat{A}(1, \cdots, 1) = 0; \quad (i = 1, \cdots, n).$$

Moreover, since $(q_1, \cdots, q_n) < \mathbf{1}$, we further have

$$0 < \hat{A}_j(1, \cdots, 1) = q_j A_j(q_1, \cdots, q_n) < +\infty$$

and by Theorem 2.1

$$\rho_{\hat{B}}(1, \cdots, 1) \leq 0.$$

Hence, by Theorem 4.1 we know that $\hat{P}(t)$ is recurrent, i.e.,

$$\int_0^\infty \hat{p}_{\mathbf{ii}}(t)dt = \int_0^\infty e^{-A(q_1, \cdots, q_n)t} p_{\mathbf{ii}}(t)dt = \infty.$$

Therefore, $\lambda_Z \leq -A(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$.

If $(q_1, \cdots, q_n) = \mathbf{1}$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, define

$$q^{(\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{ij}} = \begin{cases} a_{\mathbf{j}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| = 0 \\ \sum_{k=1}^n i_k b^{(k)(\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k) + a_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}} \cdot \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^n}(\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}), & \text{if } |\mathbf{i}| > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $b^{(k)(\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{j}} = b^{(k)}_{\mathbf{j}} - \varepsilon\delta_{\mathbf{j},\mathbf{e}_k}$. It is easy to see that $Q^{(\varepsilon)} = (q^{(\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{ij}}; \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is a nonconservative nTBI q-matrix.

For any $i = 1, \cdots, n$, define

$$B_i^{(\varepsilon)}(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} b_{\mathbf{j}}^{(i)(\varepsilon)} u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n} = B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n) - \varepsilon u_i$$

then we know that the equation $B_i^{(\varepsilon)}(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = 0$ has the minimal nonnegative solution $(q_1^{(\varepsilon)}, \cdots, q_n^{(\varepsilon)}) \in [0, 1)^n$. Moreover, $(q_1^{(\varepsilon)}, \cdots, q_n^{(\varepsilon)}) \uparrow (1, \cdots, 1)$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

Let $P^{(\varepsilon)}(t) = (p_{\mathbf{ij}}^{(\varepsilon)}; \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ be the Feller minimal $Q^{(\varepsilon)}$-function, then $p_{\mathbf{ij}}^{(\varepsilon)}(t) \leq p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)$. Indeed, the Feller minimal $Q^{(\varepsilon)}$-resolvent $\Phi^{(\varepsilon)}(\lambda) = (\phi_{\mathbf{ij}}^{(\varepsilon)}(\lambda); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is the minimal nonnegative solution of the Kolmogorov backward equation

$$\phi_{\mathbf{ij}}^{(\varepsilon)}(\lambda) = \frac{\delta_{\mathbf{ij}}}{\lambda + q_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\varepsilon)}} + \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq \mathbf{i}} \frac{q_{\mathbf{ik}}^{(\varepsilon)}}{\lambda + q_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\varepsilon)}} \phi_{\mathbf{kj}}^{(\varepsilon)}(\lambda), \quad \mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n.$$

Since the Feller minimal Q-resolvent $\Phi(\lambda) = (\phi_{\mathbf{ij}}(\lambda); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is the minimal nonnegative solution of the Kolmogorov backward equation

$$\phi_{\mathbf{ij}}(\lambda) = \frac{\delta_{\mathbf{ij}}}{\lambda + q_{\mathbf{i}}} + \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq \mathbf{i}} \frac{q_{\mathbf{ik}}}{\lambda + q_{\mathbf{i}}} \phi_{\mathbf{kj}}(\lambda), \quad \mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n.$$

Since $q_{\mathbf{ik}}^{(\varepsilon)} = q_{\mathbf{ik}}, \forall \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{k}$ and $q_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\varepsilon)} = q_{\mathbf{i}} - \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{i}_k \varepsilon, \mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Thus

$$\phi_{\mathbf{ij}}^{(\varepsilon)}(\lambda) \leq \phi_{\mathbf{ij}}(\lambda)$$

for any $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Therefore, $p_{\mathbf{ij}}^{(\varepsilon)}(t) \leq p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)$. From the above,we know $\lambda_Z^{(\varepsilon)} = -A(q_1^{(\varepsilon)}, \cdots, q_1^{(\varepsilon)})$ is the decay parameter of $P^{(\varepsilon)}(t)$. Therefore, we have $\lambda_Z \leq \lambda_Z^{(\varepsilon)} = -A(q_1^{(\varepsilon)}, \cdots, q_1^{(\varepsilon)})$. Letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ yields $\lambda_Z \leq -A(1, \cdots, 1) = -A(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$. □

Having given the decay parameter, we now consider the λ_Z-invariant vectors/ measures and quasi-stationary distribution. We first consider the λ_Z-invariant vectors. From now on, we shall assume that Q is conservative and $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$ is communicating.

Theorem 6.3. *Suppose that the q-matrix Q as defined in* (5.1)–(5.2)*, Let $P(t) = (p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ be the Feller minimal Q-function and λ_Z be the decay parameter of $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Then a λ_Z-invariant vector $(y_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ for Q (or for $P(t)$) on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$ is given by*

$$y_{\mathbf{j}} = q_1^{j_1} \cdots q_n^{j_n}, \qquad \mathbf{j} = (j_1, \cdots, j_n) \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n \tag{6.2}$$

where $(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ is the smallest nonnegative solution of (2.1)*.*

Proof. By Theorem 6.1 we know that $(y_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is a λ_Z-invariant vector for Q on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Therefore, it suffices to show that it is also λ_Z-invariant for $P(t)$ on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Indeed, by Proposition 5.4.1 in Anderson [1], we know that for any $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n \setminus \mathbf{0}} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) y_{\mathbf{j}} \leq e^{-\lambda_Z t} y_{\mathbf{i}}. \tag{6.3}$$

Hence, it follows from Kolmogorov forward equations that for $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$, $(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \in [0, q_1] \times \cdots \times [0, q_n]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p'_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)u_1^{j_1}\cdots u_n^{j_n} &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} B_j(u_1,\cdots,u_n)\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n\setminus\mathbf{0}} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(t)k_j u_1^{k_1}\cdots u_j^{k_j-1}\cdots u_n^{k_n} \\ &\quad + A(u_1,\cdots,u_n)\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(t)u_1^{k_1}\cdots u_n^{k_n} \qquad (6.4)\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)u_1^{j_1}\cdots u_n^{j_n} - u_1^{i_1}\cdots u_n^{i_n} &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} B_j(u_1,\cdots,u_n)\int_0^t \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n\setminus\mathbf{0}} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(s)k_j u_1^{k_1}\cdots u_j^{k_j-1}\cdots u_n^{k_n}ds \\ &\quad + A(u_1,\cdots,u_n)\int_0^t \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(s)u_1^{k_1}\cdots u_n^{k_n}ds\end{aligned}$$

Let $u_i = q_i (i = 1, \cdots, n)$ in the above equation, we further have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)q_1^{j_1}\cdots q_n^{j_n} - q_1^{i_1}\cdots q_n^{i_n} = A(q_1,\cdots,q_n)\int_0^t \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(s)q_1^{k_1}\cdots q_n^{k_n}ds$$

i.e.

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) - y_{\mathbf{i}} = -\lambda_Z \int_0^t \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(s)y_{\mathbf{j}}ds. \qquad (6.5)$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(s)y_{\mathbf{j}} = e^{-\lambda_Z t}y_{\mathbf{i}}.$$

which implies that $(y_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is a λ_Z-invariant for Q(or for $P(t)$) on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. □

The above Theorem gives a λ_Z-invariant vector for Q (or for $P(t)$) on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. We next consider the λ_Z-invariant measures for Q (or for $P(t)$) on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$.

Theorem 6.4. *Suppose that q-matrix Q defined in (4.1)–(4.2) is conservative, $G(1, \cdots, 1)$ is positively regular and $\{B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n); 1 \le i \le n\}$ is nonsingular. Let $P(t) = (p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ be the Feller minimal Q-function and λ_Z be the decay parameter of $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Then for any $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_Z]$,*

(i) *There exists a λ-invariant measure $(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} = (i_1, \cdots, i_n) \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ for Q on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Moreover, the generating function of this λ-invariant measure $M(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}}u_1^{i_1}\cdots u_n^{i_n}$ satisfies the following partial differential equation*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} B_i(u_1,\cdots,u_n)M_{u_i}(u_1,\cdots,u_n) + (\lambda + A(u_1,\cdots,u_n))M(u_1,\cdots,u_n) = 0. \qquad (6.6)$$

(ii) *This measure $(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} = (i_1, \cdots, i_n) \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is also λ-invariant for $P(t)$ on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$.*

(iii) *For $\lambda \le \lambda_Z$, this λ-invariant measure is convergent(i.e., $\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}} < \infty$) if and only if $\lambda = \lambda_Z$, $\rho(1,\cdots,1) \le 0$ and*

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\lambda + A(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u))}{B_1(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u))} du > -\infty$$

where $u_k(u)$ $(k = 2, \cdots, n)$ are defined in Theorem 3.1.

Proof. We first assume that $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_Z)$. It follows from Kolmogorov forward equation that for any $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$,

$$p'_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(t) q_{\mathbf{kj}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{\mathbf{i0}}(t)dt + a_{\mathbf{0}} \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{\mathbf{i0}}(t)dt + \sum_{j=1}^n b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(j)} \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{\mathbf{ie}_j}(t)dt = -\delta_{\mathbf{i0}}, \tag{6.7}$$

and for $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n \setminus \mathbf{0}$,

$$\lambda \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)dt + \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} \Big(\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(t)dt\Big) q_{\mathbf{kj}} = -\delta_{\mathbf{ij}}. \tag{6.8}$$

Denote $m_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\mathbf{i})} = (\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{\mathbf{i0}}(t)dt)^{-1} \cdot \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)dt$ and $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\mathbf{i})} = (\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{\mathbf{i0}}(t)dt)^{-1} \cdot \delta_{\mathbf{ij}}$, then (6.7) and (6.8) can be rewritten as

$$(\lambda + a_{\mathbf{0}}) m_{\mathbf{0}}^{(\mathbf{i})} + \sum_{j=1}^n m_{\mathbf{e}_j}^{(\mathbf{i})} b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(j)} = -\varepsilon_{\mathbf{0}}^{(\mathbf{i})} \tag{6.9}$$

and for $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n \setminus \mathbf{0}$,

$$\lambda m_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\mathbf{i})} + \sum_{\mathbf{k}\le\mathbf{j}+\mathbf{1}} m_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\mathbf{i})} q_{\mathbf{kj}} = -\varepsilon_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\mathbf{i})}. \tag{6.10}$$

Let $H = \{l \ge 0;\ b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(l)} = 0\} \ne \emptyset$, then by the irreducibility we know that

(a) for any $l \in H$, there exists $\mathbf{k}$ such that $q_{\mathbf{k}e_l} > 0$ and $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{0}$ or $\mathbf{k} = e_i$ for some $i \ne l$ or $\mathbf{k} = e_l + e_i$ for some $i \ne l$.

(b) there exists $\mathbf{k} \in \{e_l; l \in H\}^c$ such that $q_{\mathbf{k}e_l} > 0$ for some $l \in H$.

By (a), (b) and note that $m_{\mathbf{0}}^{(\mathbf{i})} = 1$ and $m_{\mathbf{e}_j}^{(\mathbf{i})} \ge 0 (j = 1, \cdots, n)$, it can be seen from (6.9) and (6.10) that there exist $(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} = (i_1, \cdots, i_n) \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ which is nonnegative and finite such that

$$\lambda m_{\mathbf{j}} + \sum_{\mathbf{k}\le\mathbf{j}+\mathbf{1}} m_{\mathbf{k}} q_{\mathbf{kj}} = 0, \quad \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n. \tag{6.11}$$

Now we claim that all $m_{\mathbf{j}}$ $(\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ are positive. Indeed, note that $m_{\mathbf{0}} > 0$. If $m_{\tilde{\mathbf{j}}} = 0$ for some $\tilde{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$, then by the irreducibility of $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$, we know that there exists $\mathbf{j}_0 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{j}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{j}_n = \tilde{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$ such that

$$q_{\mathbf{j}_k\mathbf{j}_{k+1}} > 0, \quad k = 0, \cdots, n-1.$$

Hence by repeatedly using (6.11) we know that $m_{\mathbf{0}} = 0$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $(m_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is a λ_Z-invariant measure for Q on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. By letting $\lambda \uparrow \lambda_Z$ in (6.11) and a similar argument as above, we get a λ_Z-invariant measure for Q on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$.

Since $\lambda < -a_{\mathbf{0}}$, multiplying $u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n}$ on both sides of (6.11) and summing over $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$ yields that for $|u_1|, \cdots, |u_n| < (-a_{\mathbf{0}} - \lambda)(\max\{b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(i)}; i = 1, \cdots, n\})^{-1}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n) M_{u_i}(u_1, \cdots, u_n) + (\lambda + A(u_1, \cdots, u_n)) M(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = 0 \qquad (6.12)$$

where $M(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{j}} u_1^{j_1} \cdots u_n^{j_n}$. Since there exists $(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \uparrow (q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ such that $B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n) > 0$, it is easily seen that (6.12) holds for $(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \in [0, q_1) \times \cdots \times [0, q_n)$. (i) is proved.

Next, we prove (ii). Denote $g_{\mathbf{j}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t),\ \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} g_{\mathbf{k}}(t) q_{\mathbf{kj}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(t) q_{\mathbf{kj}} = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}} p'_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} q_{\mathbf{ik}} p_{\mathbf{kj}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}} q_{\mathbf{ik}} p_{\mathbf{kj}}(t) \\
&= -\lambda g_{\mathbf{j}}(t)
\end{aligned}$$

and hence $(g_{\mathbf{j}}(t); \mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{0})$ is also a λ-invariant measure for Q. On the other hand, it follows from the Kolomogorov forward equation we have

$$p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) - \delta_{\mathbf{ij}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \int_0^t p_{\mathbf{ik}}(u) du \cdot q_{\mathbf{kj}}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}} |p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t + \Delta t) - p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)| &\leq \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{j+1}} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(u) du \cdot |q_{\mathbf{kj}}| \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{j+1}} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(u) du \cdot |q_{\mathbf{kj}}| \\
&\leq \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{j+1}} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} e^{-\lambda u} m_{\mathbf{k}} du \cdot |q_{\mathbf{kj}}| \\
&= \int_t^{t+\Delta t} e^{-\lambda u} du \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{j+1}} m_{\mathbf{k}} |q_{\mathbf{kj}}| \\
&\to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $\Delta t \to 0$ since $\sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{j+1}} m_{\mathbf{k}} |q_{\mathbf{kj}}|$ is finite. Thus, $g_{\mathbf{j}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}} p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)$ is a continuous function of $t \in [0, \infty)$ and hence

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}} p'_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{j+1}} m_{\mathbf{i}} p_{\mathbf{ik}}(t) q_{\mathbf{kj}}$$

is also continuous. Therefore, by analysis theory we know that $\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}}p'_{\mathbf{ij}}(t)$ is uniformly convergent on any bounded interval and hence

$$g'_{\mathbf{j}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}}p'_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) = -\lambda g_{\mathbf{j}}(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

which implying that

$$g_{\mathbf{j}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbf{Z}_+^n} m_{\mathbf{i}}p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t) = g_{\mathbf{j}}(0)e^{-\lambda t} = m_{\mathbf{j}}e^{-\lambda t}.$$

Therefore, $(m_{\mathbf{j}}; \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is λ-invariant for $P(t)$.

Now we prove (iii). Suppose that $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) > 0$. If $M(1, \cdots, 1) < \infty$, then $\lambda_Z = -A(q_1, \cdots, q_n) > 0$ and (6.12) holds for $(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \in [0, 1)^n$, furthermore,

$$\lim_{u_1\uparrow 1, \cdots, u_n\uparrow 1} \sum_{j=1}^{n} B_j(u_1, \cdots, u_n)M_{u_j}(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = 0. \tag{6.13}$$

Letting $(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \uparrow (1, \cdots, 1)$ in (6.12) yields a contradiction.

Suppose that $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \leq 0$. By (6.12) and Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\frac{M'(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u))}{M(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u))} = -\frac{\lambda + A(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u))}{B_1(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u))}$$

where $u_k(u)$ $(k = 2, \cdots, n)$ are defined in Theorem 3.1 and $M' = \frac{dM}{du}$. Hence,

$$M(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u)) = M_{\mathbf{0}}e^{-\int_0^1 \frac{\lambda + A(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u))}{B_1(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u))}du}$$

which implies the conclusion. □

Based on the λ_Z-invariant measure on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$, we finally present the quasi-stationary distributions for $P(t)$ on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$.

Theorem 6.5. *Suppose that q-matrix Q defined in* (4.1)–(4.2) *is conservative,* $G(1, \cdots, 1)$ *is positively regular and* $\{B_i(u_1, \cdots, u_n); 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ *is nonsingular. Let* $P(t) = (p_{\mathbf{ij}}(t); \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ *be the Feller minimal Q-function and* λ_Z *be the decay parameter of* $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. *Then there exists a quasi-stationary distribution for* $P(t)$ *on* $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$ *if and only if* $\rho(1, \cdots, 1) \leq 0$ *and*

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\lambda + A(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u))}{B_1(u, u_2(u), \cdots, u_n(u))}du > -\infty.$$

Moreover, if these conditions hold, then the quasi-stationary distribution $\{(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)\}$ *satisfies the equation (6.6) with* $\lambda = \lambda_Z$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.1 of Nair & Pollett[11], a probability distribution $(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is a quasi-stationary distribution for $P(t)$ on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$ if and only if for some $\lambda > 0$, $(m_{\mathbf{i}}; \mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n)$ is λ-invariant for $P(t)$ on $\mathbf{Z}_+^n$. Thus the conclusions follow from Theorem 6.4. □

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the National Natural Sciences Foundation of China (,No.11371374, No.11571372), Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education of China (No.20110162110060), the Graduate degree thesis Innovation Foundation of Hunan Province (No.CX2011B077).

References

[1] Anderson, W.(1991) Continuous-Time Markov Chains: An Applications-Oriented Approach. *Springer-Verlag, New York*.

[2] Aksland, M.(1977) A birth, death and migration process with immigration. *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, **7**, 44-60.

[3] Asmussen, S. and Hering, H.(1983) Branching Processes. Birkhauser, Boston.

[4] Athreya, K. B. and Jagers, P.(1996). Classical and Modern Branching Processes. Springer, Berlin.

[5] Athreya, K.B. and Ney, P.E.(1972) Branching Processes. Springer, Berlin.

[6] Chen, M.F.(1992) From Markov Chains to Non-Equilibrium Particle Systems. *World Scientific, Singapore*.

[7] Chen, S.X.(2006) An introduction to modern partial differential equations. *The Science Press.* .

[8] Darroch, J.N. and Seneta, E.(1967) On quasi-stationary distributions in absorbing continuous-time finite Markov chains. *J. Appl. Prob.* **245**, 192-196.

[9] Flaspohler, D.C.(1974) Quasi-stationary distributions for absorbing continuous-time denumerable Markov chains. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **26**, 351-356.

[10] Foster, F. G.(1971) A limit theorem for a branching process with state-dependent immigration. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **42**, 1773-1776.

[11] Harris, T.E.(1963) The Theory of Branching Processes. Springer, Berlin and New York.

[12] Kelly, F.P.(1983) Invariant measures and the generator. *In Kingman, J.F.C. and Reuter, G.E., eds. Probability, Statistics, and Analysis.* **79**, 143-160.

[13] Kijima, M.(1963) Quasi-limiting distributions of Markov chains that are skip-free to the left in continuous-time. *J. Appl. Prob.*. **30**, 509-517.

[14] Kingman, J.F.C.(1963) The exponential decay of Markov transition probability. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **13**, 337-358.

[15] Li, J.P.(2009) Decay parameter and related properties of 2-type branching processes. *Science in China Series A:Mathematics.* **52**:875-894.

[16] Li, J.P., Chen, A.Y.(2006) Markov Branching Processes with Immigration and Resurrection. *Markov Processes Relat. Fields*, **12**, 139-168.

[17] Li, J.P., Wang, J.(2012) Decay parameter and related properties of n-type branching processes. *Science in China Series A:Mathematics.* **55**:2535-2556.

[18] Nair,M.G. and Pollett,P.K.(1993) On the relationship between μ-invariant measures and quasi-stationary distributions for continuous-time Markov chains. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*. **25**, 82-102.

[19] Pakes, A.G.(1971) A branching process with a state-dependent immigration component. *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, 3, 301-314.

[20] Pakes, A.G. and Tavaré, S.(1981) Comments on the age distribution of Markov processes. *Adv. Appl. Prob.* , 13, 681-703.

[21] Pollett, P.K.(1986) On the equivalence of mu-invariant measures for the minimal process and its q-matrix. *Stochastic Proc. Appl.*. **22**, 203-221.

[22] Pollett, P.K.(1988) Reversibility, invariance and μ-invariance. *Adv.Appl.Prob.* **20**, 600-621.

[23] Pollett, P.K.(1995) The determeination of quasi-instationary distribution directly from the transition rates of an absorbing Markov chain. *Mathl.Comput.Modelling* **22**, 279-287.

[24] Pollett, P.K.(1999) Quasi-stationary distributions for continuous time Markov chains when absorption is not certain. *J. Appl. Prob.*. **36**, 268-272.

[25] Sevast'yanov, B. A.(1957) Limit theorems for branching stochastic processes of special form. *Theory Prob. Applications.* **2**, (3):321-331.

[26] Vatutin, V. A.(1974) The asymptotic probability of the first degeneration for branching processes with immigration. *Theory Prob. Applications.* **19**, (1):25-34.

[27] Vatutin, V. A.(1977) A conditional limit theorem for a critical branching process with immigration. *Mathematical Notes.* **21**, 405-411.

[28] Yamazato, M.(1975) Some results on continuous time branching processes with state-dependent immigration. *J. Math. Soc. Japan.* **17**, 479-497.

[29] Tweedie, R.L.(1974) Some ergodic properties of the Feller minimal process. *Quart, J. Math. Oxford.* **(2)25**, 485-493.

[30] Vere-Jones, D.(1962) Geometric ergidicity in denumerable Markov chains. *Quart, J. Math. Oxford.* **(2)13**, 7-28.

[31] Van Doorn, E.A.(1985) Conditions for exponential ergodicity and bounds for the decay parameter of a birth-death process. *Adv. appl. Prob.*. **17**, 514-530.

[32] Van Doorn, E.A.(1991) Quasi-stationary distributions and convergence to quasi-stationarity of birth-death processes. *Adv. appl. Prob.* **23**, 683-700.

[33] Yaglom, A.M.(1947) Certain limit theorems of the theory of branching processes. *Dokl. Acad. Nauk SSSR.* **56**, 795-798.